

Medical and Surgical Science,

AS EXPOUNDED BY

E. S. GAILLARD, M.D.

EX-PROFESSOR OF THE KENTUCKY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE; EX-PROFESSOR OF A MEDICAL SCHOOL IN VIRGINIA; AND EX-PROFESSOR IN THE CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE; AUTHOR OF A "PRIZE" ESSAY ON DIPHTHERIA; CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE GYNÆCOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF BOSTON; DEALER IN BOOKS, INSTRUMENTS AND CRAIG'S MICROSCOPES; EDITOR OF THE RICHMOND & LOUISVILLE MEDICAL JOURNAL, Etc., Etc.

By T. S. BELL, M.D., Professor of the Science and Practice of Medicine, in the University of Louisville, Kentucky.

I am quite sure that there is no member of the medical profession who dislikes and loathes professional strife more than I do, nor one who more sedulously avoids giving occasion for any thing of the kind. There was nothing known to me, in the relations between Dr. Gaillard and myself, that gave rise to any suspicion on my part that he entertained even ill-will toward me, to say nothing of a profound malevolence, a studied, deliberate malice. In his *Richmond Journal*, for January, 1868, he made this *public covenant* with his subscribers: "Devoted as this journal is, to the progress and development of medical science, *nothing of a personal, political or controversial character will be published in its pages. It has been independent of all factions, of all personal or corporate interests, and it will always so remain, the Editor seeking, only, to make it the exponent of the scientific views of the profession at large.*"

In the June number, for 1868, of the *Richmond & Louisville Journal*, Dr. Gaillard, after procuring the names of a number of medical men as associate editors, I being one of them, made this *public covenant* with them, and with his new subscribers in

Kentucky : “ *Nothing of a personal, political or controversial character has been published in its pages, and this rule will be preserved inviolate.*” Joseph Surface never uttered “finer sentiments,” nor did that master of “fine sentiments” ever show greater facility in violating them, than the editor of the *Richmond & Louisville Journal*. The attack upon me was one of the most wanton, malevolent and unprovoked things of the kind that I ever saw. The lecture which he undertook to—through courtesy, I may say, review, was not a medical lecture ; it did not come within the purview of a journal “devoted to the progress and development of medical science,” and the lecture itself had nothing in it calculated to call forth the malevolence, malice, venom and bitterness displayed by Dr. Gaillard. With an utter disregard of his public covenants to his associate editors, to his subscribers, and to the medical profession in general, Dr. Gaillard “emptied the drains” of his malice into his muddy receptacle, which he thinks is “the river of journalistic literature.” He made his work as insulting to me as he could make it. He seemed to write for those “who have a *penchant* for luscious filth, and who can smack their lips over carrion.” Long before I wrote a line in answer, letters came to me from various parts of Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and other States, asking the meaning of Dr. Gaillard’s violent, malicious, personal attack upon me. Under these circumstances, I determined to examine into the claims of my pretentious critic. I avoided everything of a personal character; I tried him before the public on his writings and public matters alone. He stood revealed a thorough charlatan. If there was any severity in this exposition, the severity was in the truthfulness of every word that I uttered, which cut the keener from the fact that Dr. Gaillard himself furnished each barb to the arrows that filled my quiver. In publishing my reply to Dr. Gaillard’s furious, malevolent, abusive assault upon me, I took the advice of some of the most eminent medical men, and of some unprofessional gentlemen of the highest character, in the State of Kentucky, all of whom had read the Gaillard attack, and every one of these gentlemen approved my reply before I sent it off for publication. An assailed man is the best judge of the bearing of an attack upon

him, and of this, in Dr. Gaillard's assault, I was the sole judge. As to the proper dealing with him, after I had prepared that dealing, I asked the advice of men who are esteemed generally as just in all their views.

When my terrible expositions of Dr. Gaillard's sins of almost every description in composition were brought before his eyes, under the lights of honest criticism, he felt himself utterly ruined. Goliath, in his defiance of Israel, scarcely blustered at a more extravagant rate than Dr. Gaillard did in his literary championship, nor was the destruction of the Philistine greater than that of the vaunting Dr. Gaillard. His weak, miserable, craven response in the July number of his journal, is a full acknowledgment of his overthrow; but in addition to this, I have good authority for knowing that he is engaged in writing whimpering, whining letters to such editors of medical journals as he supposes may be induced to listen to his piteous groans, beseeching them to hold him up and condemn me. This shows his own sense of the fact that I have wounded him beyond the reach of any remedy of his own. I think that he will not very soon undertake another literary warfare. I never saw a more forlorn-looking object in any field of literature than the pompous editor of the *Richmond & Louisville Journal*.

I have not, heretofore, said anything of the lecture on which the donkey criticism of Dr. Gaillard was made. That which drew forth the Gaillard flood of malevolence and botchery has commanded the approval of some of the highest scientific authorities on this continent. I have letters from many eminent scholars, which speak in terms of praise of the lecture, higher than my estimate of it. One of the leading monthly magazines of this country, recently said of it: "Among other volumes of lesser note which we have received during the past month, we group a few together here in a single paragraph. Professor Theodore S. Bell, of Louisville, Kentucky, sends us an interesting and instructive pamphlet on the *Pre-historic ages of Scandinavia and the Lacustrine dwellers of Switzerland*. From the implements found in the peat bogs of Denmark, and from the remains of ancient villages found beneath the waters of lake Zurich, as well as from a brief consideration of some monu-

mental evidences of ancient Phœnician life, he sketches very briefly these civilizations of antiquity for the purpose of pointing out the moral unity, and tracing the progress of mankind. His limits are such as necessarily render the discussion but a sketch. We miss, too, the diagrams and illustrations with which the original lecture was accompanied. But the outline he affords is sufficient to show his familiarity with the subject; and he combines a spirit of reverence for religious truth with that fearlessness of investigation which is the first condition of true science."

The officers of some of the most prominent libraries of this country have requested copies of the lecture for the institutions with which they are connected, and have expressed their gratification in having this lecture in their institutions. It is true that no one of these sources wrote me such a letter as Dr. Gaillard says the committee of the State Medical Society of Georgia wrote to him about his Essay on Diphtheria—"a letter of extravagant and untenable eulogy."

In view of these general and competent testimonies, I am warranted in looking on the Gaillard effusion as a spiteful, malicious, malevolent, abusive, unprovoked attack, at once personal, political and controversial, combining in itself the three sins of which he pledged himself to his associate editors, to his subscribers, and to the medical profession, he would never be guilty.

I have ever tried to be faithful to the Code of Medical Ethics, and I know of nothing in it that requires of me, in any position in the profession, to submit quietly to a violent, inexcusable assault, for which there is not a shadow of excuse, except a causeless malice. This, however, is a thing to which I will not submit. Dr. Gaillard made a deliberate, insolent, insulting attack upon me, and I, the only one entitled to do so, directed my line of defense. It is Dr. Gaillard's fault and misfortune that he made an aggressive war, without any means of carrying it on. He went to war, not only without counting the cost, but without any idea of the direful poverty of his resources. I am very certain that he was under the impression that he could write English, until I demonstrated, to his cognizance, if not to his satisfaction, that he is often incapable of writing the most ordinary

thought in intelligible language. Under these, and other unprovoked public insults which it is not necessary to mention here, I should have felt myself utterly degraded had I permitted Dr. Gaillard to pass unnoticed and unpunished. If his punishment is severe and rankling, it must be remembered that his offense was grievous beyond aught of the kind that I have ever seen in anything, even purporting to be medical literature. Dr. Gaillard wantonly and ruthlessly assailed me under the sham covert of medical journalistic criticism. In meeting him, I determined to subject his claims to be ranked as a critic, to the legitimate ordeal of criticism of his public writings. I studiously abstained from everything like personalities, beyond those that are inseparable from an author in a criticism upon his writings. Dr. Gaillard thinks that I did not make a suitable "fit." This is not my fault; Dr. Gaillard manufactured the tawdry material, and cut every part of it himself. My use of "the thimble" seems to stir his aristocratic blood, even more than my pen, mercilessly as he knows that this cut him, and he blubbers like a whipped boy. I have another thimble, with which I honestly and honorably worked my way into the medical profession, and I would not exchange it for all the money that Dr. Gaillard has received or may hereafter receive for degrading medical literature with "prize essay" nonsense, including *per centage* puffs of Craig's microscopes. From the position I have reached in my profession, without asking for it or seeking for it, I can afford to look down upon the puny, grovelling, pitiable writhings of a pseudo-critic, that I have stripped bare to the gaze of the medical profession, and to the horror of two or three bottle-holders, the distressed critic has importuned into helping him out of his own mire.

The poor pretender to position and authority in matters of learning, whose pretensions I mercilessly exposed in the June number of the *Nashville Journal*, in answer to a malicious, unprovoked attack made upon me in the *Richmond & Louisville Medical Journal*, has ventured to court another exposition. In the July number of his miserable medical periodical, in utter violation of the pledges to his subscribers, which I have quoted, ex-professor Gaillard makes, what he intended should be, a vio-

lent personal assault upon Professor Bowling and myself. Its malice is very willing, but its ability is very weak. It is difficult to say in which there is an exhibition of the largest mass of crudities; the ignorance or the manners of ex-professor Gaillard.

I am satisfied from a perusal of Dr. Gaillard's recent very peevish, petulant, and wishey-washey production, that silence, under the merited inflictions he has received, would have been quite as useful to him as his scurrility can be. He does not, simply because he cannot, call in question the perfect truth of my various criticisms upon his Gaillardisms. He does not attempt to defend his stupid phrases, nor himself from his demonstrated medical ignorance. He came to Louisville with a great parade as a medical teacher for two metropolitan cities. He assumed a position as a lecturer in the Kentucky school, on medical science. He felt that he was the sun of that school, and that his colleagues were mere satellites, moving at various distances around him, when there is not one of them who is not his superior in medical science and in scholarship. He wrote and published deliberately: "I shall consider scarlatina and scarlet fever as *for the most part identical*." A man so stupidly ignorant of medical science as not to know that these two words mean one and the same thing, would be a disgrace to student life. Yet, he has the cool assurance to pretend that he is qualified to *teach* medical science. The author of the sentence, "I shall consider scarlatina and scarlet fever as for the most part identical" shows that he does not know even the alphabet of his profession. That simple sentence is a certificate, that indubitably proves the universal ignorance of its author in medical matters. There is not, in any utterance of his in other medical scribbling that has reached me, a single contradiction to the truth of that certificate. I have labelled Dr. Gaillard for life, with that quotation from the "prize" essay on diphtheria. It will, as the shirt of Nessus, stick to him as long as he lives. He quietly submitted to what I said of it in my answer to his scurrilous attack on me, because he knew that in silence he must bear what no mortal could defend. Nor does he, in his pretense at answering me, attempt to defend the stupid sentence: "scar-

let fever tends to create an exemption from succeeding its attack." Nor does he pretend to defend his diphtherical blunder in using *pathognomic* for pathognomonic, nor any of the other abominations that I cited in multitudinous troops from his immortal diphtherical prize essay. He wears the marks of the critic's lash, because he cannot help himself. I take his anger, his grumbling anger, as his certificate to the thoroughness with which I did my work on him. The blast of a simoon was never more withering than Dr. Gaillard feels my criticisms on him to be. He should have, at least, the sense of Zanga, in Dr. Young's tragedy of *The Revenge*. Zanga said of *his* master, "great let me call him, for he conquered me." The more the Diphtherical essayist disparages me, the more he belittles himself, and all who have read my criticism on his prize essay, will admit that further belittling is not among his wants.

Dr. Gaillard is altogether the most helpless imbecile that I ever knew to court, crave and force controversy. I do not think that any man could feasibly claim any credit for whipping him on any subject. I have never known his equal as a bungler in anything that I have seen him undertake. There are occasions made by him when it is difficult to believe in his sanity. DeQuincey, that inveterate opium eater, says, "but the incapacitation which I speak of here, as due to opium, is of another kind and another degree. It is mere childish helplessness, or senile paralysis of the judgment, which distresses the man in attempting to grasp the upshot and the total effect (the *tout ensemble*) of what he has himself so recently produced. There is the same instability in attempting to hold things steadily together, and to bring them under a comprehensive or unifying act of the judging faculty, as there is in the efforts of a drunken man to follow a chain of reasoning." It is possible that other causes may produce this chaos of mind. No matter what may be the cause, the effects described by DeQuincey are very conspicuous in Dr. Gaillard's scribblings. The only possible defense of the multitudinous specimens of giiberish in the diphtherical essay would be made in showing that they were misquotations, perversions, or by proving that the so-called jargon is good English. Instead of this, the whipped critic attempts to say that some respecta-

ble men have spoken well of the diphtherical essay, as if that amounts to anything, when the sins of the essay cry aloud from its house-tops and its street corners, indeed, from every nook and cranny of the pitiful thing. Of what avail is the praise of committees, when the essay itself speaks in the most ruinous manner against its author? What use can there be in certificates that are against fact, reason, and the best judgment of the human faculties? Dr. Gaillard's prize essay on Diphtheria is the vilest abortion in medical literature that I have ever seen; it is difficult to believe that it was written by a medical man; it is altogether impossible to believe that it was written by one with even ordinary pretensions to scholarship. The author's peurile attempts to bolster the thing by *his* statements of what this or that medical man is represented to have said about it, are miserable failures. Even if he had the affidavits of a whole college of Doctors, or of a State Medical Society, they would not change the bungling, miserable, tasteless character of the essay; nor alter its specimens of ignorance, nor its stupid gibberish, nor remove its demonstrative failure in Latinity. There are things that certificates cannot perform, as Dr. Gaillard's sore and confounding experience has taught him, in his recent senseless warfare upon the University. The "evidences" to which the unhappy author of the Diphtherical Essay appeals, within the hearing of the damning outcries of nearly every portion of the prize essay, are akin to the testimony which Admiral Coffin, of the British navy, undertook to use, while on a visit to his American relatives about Cape Cod. The old man said on one occasion, that he had seen lobsters, each of which weighed twenty pounds, which was disputed. The old gentleman, feeling that his veracity was in jeopardy, offered to bet one hundred dollars that he could produce a lobster of the weight named. The bet was taken, the writings were drawn, the money was "put up," referees were appointed, and the day was named for the decision. The old Admiral went among the fishermen, and offered tempting rewards to any one who would catch the required lobster. To the old man's mortification, all efforts at catching a lobster of twenty pounds weight were like Dr. Gaillard's attempts at writing English and translating Latin—utter

failures. On the day for the decision of the bet, the referees made their appearance, the parties to the bet were present. The referees opened the paper on which the bet was recorded, read it aloud, and asked the Admiral for his lobster. The old man announced that he had not succeeded in getting one of the proper kind, but that he had a number of certificates from respectable parties, stating that they thought they had seen lobsters that weighed twenty pounds, and the Admiral said that he wished the referees to consider the certificates in deciding the bet. The referees then requested the two parties to retire, until called. In a short time the doors were thrown open, and the parties were admitted. The question was put by the Admiral, as to the decision. The chairman of the referees replied by handing the Admiral his pile of certificates, on which was endorsed very legibly:—certificates are not lobsters. And thus I say to the "prize" essayist on diphtheria. Even "a letter of extravagant and untenable eulogy," from a committee of the Georgia State Medical Society to the "prize essayist," cannot obliterate a single one of the hundreds of loud-crying sins of the essay itself. They will cry out as long as that bantling lives, but fortunately it is rapidly on its way to "the tomb of the Capulets." The pathognomic signs in Dr. Gaillard's supplement are pathognomonic of the approaching death of his unfortunate, tiny, puny diphtherical bantling.

The unhappy author of *the Essay*, gives a singular and decisive exhibition of that muddled state of things in his mind, so well described in the quotation from DeQuincey. I gather from Dr. Gaillard's historic sketch, that after all, the prize for this diphtherical essay was but little, if any more than that sounding phrase in some awards "honorable mention." The Georgia Society was unable even to print the "prize essay" This part of the affair is akin to a scene that occurred in the life of Governor Scott of Kentucky. While he was an officer under Washington, he was sent by his chief as bearer of dispatches to General Green. In passing through North Carolina, Scott was seized with intermittent fever. He was lying in the shade of a tree, and soon after the hot stage of the attack came on, Scott saw an Indian walking through the woods. He hailed the In-

dian, and induced him to sit down and talk with him. Scott learned that the Indian was a preacher to some of the Indians of North Carolina, and he enquired of the Indian respecting his pay. The Indian said that some gave him old clothes, others bread, others a little meat sometimes. Scott with an oath remarked that that was poor pay. "Yes" said the Indian with an oath, "and poor preach too." And so it is with the "prize" essayist, Dr. Gaillard. If he got poor pay, the State Society got very poor preaching. But Dr. Gaillard, with one of those geyral exhibitions that seem peculiar to him, says, that the committee of the State Medical Society of Georgia wrote a letter to him, "of *extravagant and untenable eulogy*," that is a wild irregular eulogy, going out of fixed or proper limits! a eulogy "that cannot be held, maintained or defended.!!" Whether Dr. Gaillard resorts to this stabbing of the committee of the State Medical Society of Georgia, for not sending him money instead of "untenable eulogy," or because he did not know what he was saying, I cannot explain. If the committee praised, in the slightest degree, the essay, *that* was extravagant; if it approved it in any way, that was "untenable eulogy" In my judgment, the appropriate duty of the committee was to write an elegy on the essay, a eulogy being entirely out of place. Yet Dr. Gaillard is evidently angry with the Georgia committee, with or without cause. I can easily understand his wrath toward me, for the illustrious McFingal says:—

"The will's confirmed by treatment horrid,
As hides grow harder when they're curried;
No man e'er felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law,
Or held, in method orthodox,
His love of justice in the stocks."

I cannot see why Dr. Gaillard does not devote himself entirely to writing prize essays, if, as he says, he came near getting a prize from the American Medical Association, but did not get it; if he obtained an empty honor from the Georgia State Medical Society, accompanied with "a letter of extravagant and untenable eulogy," to which was added the privilege of printing the essay at his own expense, and giving it to such persons as he could induce to accept it as a present. How fortunate that he

could not force persons to read it. Are not these favors encouraging to the prize-essayist? Why not keep up this delightful work? I venture, with due humility, to suggest Craig's Microscopes as a suitable subject. He is very prolific on that.

In one of his periodic quarrels, he calls Dr. Schmidt, of New Orleans, to task for some criticisms upon the pathology of diphtheria. In the course of his "splurging" about Dr. Schmidt, the "prize" essayist says that the diction of the "prize" essay is his own, *i. e.* that whatever else in it was borrowed, the diction is not borrowed. Now, I would not do an act of injustice to the ex-professor, merely because of his outrages toward me, and, as I am the only person besides the essayist, that I have ever heard of as having read the thing, I feel it due to truth to say that no one, but Dr. Gaillard, has yet appeared in English literature who could have made the diction of the diphtherical essay. I have had propositions for the use, as unapproachable violations of syntax, of the quotations made by me, for future editions of English grammars. The genius of the best writers of English could scarcely conceive of such violations of syntax, as flow spontaneously from the oozy mud of Dr. Gaillard's brain. With this act of justice to the "prize" essayist, I may bid adieu to the diphtherical essay, under the assurance of Dr. Gaillard's conduct, that the universal, leprous sores of the Gaillardisms of the essay are beyond remedy.

Dr. Gaillard, without any cause, without any excuse, commenced a violent, insolent, personal attack upon me, under the pretense of reviewing a lecture, of the subjects of which he was as stupidly ignorant, as he is of everything else that I have known him to write about. He invited a literary controversy, but as I knew that he is devoid of all literary merit, I felt satisfied that he would precipitately retreat from that field, at the first touch of a literary spear, and become one of Dean Swift's Yahoos, who, unable to reason, attempt to stifle with filth. I will not be a Yahoo, for the very good reason that I do not admire the character; and I will not be one for the accommodation of a defeated, thoroughly whipped critic, who loudly howls in his baffled rage.

I turn now to additional expositions of the arrant pretender,

who has played the blusterer more in his two years of medical editorial life than all the other editors of medical journals in this country put together. A row is the breath of his nostrils. He says, that until about eight months ago I was not known outside of Louisville, a statement that I shall not honor with a contradiction, but I beg leave to assure him, that he would be singularly blessed if he were not known *in* this city, and the city would be more so. I have never known a physician enter Louisville with a warmer welcome from the profession. Nearly the entire profession lavished kindness upon him, and if he had possessed learning, medical knowledge and good manners, he could have won an amount of consulting business here, that would have occupied a large share of his time. His condition awakened laudably the sympathies of the medical profession.

It is evident to my reading of the recent Gaillardisms, that the non-professor has been sitting on Jack Clayton's "old slut of a hen's nest," for several weeks, in the vain hope of incubating something for me that should match the "spread." As a scintillation of Gaillard genius, I give the result of the ornithological "sitting." In referring to my statement that I had a number of Gaillardisms in abeyance, for a future occasion, this brilliant genius admonishes me that I may be like the goose that sat on serpent's eggs! I did not know, until he gave the information, that he belongs to the reptilian class of vertebrates. Is he related to that old serpent that commenced on the earth the arts of pretension and of beguiling in the garden of Eden? As *he* paints Gaillardisms as serpent's eggs, I am content to be the incubating goose. The poorest goose is a reputable animal compared with any serpent known to me. Did the non-professor derive his idea of the uncomfortable nature of a brood of Gaillardisms from the congress of the things that met his despairing gaze as he looked at the crawling and creeping specimens that I drew from that serpent's nest of uncleanness—the "prize" essay on diphtheria? That they hissed in his ears, and bit him sharply, I can readily understand, as I look at the writhings and contortions he exhibits, as he calls up memories of the occasion so eventful to him.

Dr. Gaillard shows almost incredible weakness, even for him

in pleading the blunders of other men as a justification for his heinous offenses as a writer. That is the true man, who in everything sedulously works to ascertain the right in all things, and who, irrespective of the blunders of other people, pursues the right. The law of the English language is, that the proper place for the adverb is, where it clearly, indubitably makes a limitation of the word that is to be qualified. It does not matter how many persons violate this law; the number proves only the number of violations. Neither two nor any number of wrongs ever make one right. It is very paltry, even in a distressed critic to attempt to defend himself from violations of grammar, by showing that other people have been guilty of similar violations.

There is a law respecting adverbs, adjectives, and personal pronouns, by which every scholar regulates his use of them. That law is, that they shall be so placed in a sentence as to express the meaning of the writer clearly, and, in thus placing these parts of speech, true scholarship is shown. Dr. Blair says, "the fact is, with respect to such adverbs—*only, wholly, at least*, and the rest of that tribe, that in common discourse, the tone and emphasis we use in pronouncing them, generally serve to show their reference, and to make the meaning clear; and hence we acquire the habit of throwing them in loosely in the course of a period. *But in writing, where a man speaks to the eye and not to the ear, he ought to be more accurate, and so connect those adverbs with the words which they qualify, as to put his meaning out of doubt upon the first inspection.*" Mr. Moon, in his terrible castigation of the dean of Canterbury, was not more triumphant on any one point than in showing the proper placing of adverbs. The dean of Canterbury wrote, "where we *merely* speak of numbers, the verb is better singular." "Now, here," as Mr. Moon shows, "this placing of *merely* limits it to a limitation of the word speak." "But," as Mr. Moon says, "what if we write of numbers?" This, at a glance shows that the dean did not place his adverb properly. Merely was designed as a limitation to the word numbers, and the sentence should have been written, "where we speak of numbers *merely*, etc." Dr. Gaillard seems to me to have no more definite idea of the use of adverbs than if they had just been

introduced into our language. Yet, a scholar can determine in a few minutes the scholarship of a writer, by seeing his use of adjectives, adverbs, and personal pronouns, and, under observations on these points, I find in all of Dr. Gaillard's writings, a charnel-house of these murdered parts of speech. The attempt on the part of the defeated critic to cover his inglorious condition, by showing that other writers have violated grammatical rules, is confession of judgment. He thus acknowledges his utter defeat.

In the grievous straits into which I have driven the poor critic, he appeals to the language, interpolated into what is called the Lord's prayer; "for thine *is* the kingdom, the power and the glory," to prove that a verb need not agree in number with its nominative! No one, but this distressed, badly beaten critic has uttered such nonsense as this. A scholar would be ashamed to write such stuff. I suppose, according to Dr. Gaillard, it is proper to say, "Our father, *which* art in Heaven," because it occurs in the Lord's prayer. On the philological logic of the great Gaillard, I suppose it is correct English to say, "that worthy name by *the which* ye are called," because the Apostle James is made to say it. According to the non-professor, it is useless to pay any attention to the nominatives of verbs, because Gibbon wrote:

"The *richness* of *her* arms and apparel *were* conspicuous in the foremost ranks."

Junius wrote:

"*Both* minister and magistrate *is* compelled to choose between *his* duty and *his* reputation."

Macaulay wrote:

"The poetry and eloquence of the Augustan age *was* assiduously studied," etc.

Addison says:

"I do not mean that I think *any one* to blame for taking due care of *their* health."

I take these examples from Gould's "Good English." Now, a good scholar, or a student who searches after purity of style, instead of looking to these great names as beacons to lure him into violations of grammar and sense, as Dr. Gaillard does,

would recognize them as warnings to watch with care his use of language. No one of the writers, from whom the quotations have just been made, would have attempted to defend his violation of the law regulating the relation of the verb to its nominative, in the English language. Each of them had the advantage over Dr. Gaillard, in being a scholar, and any one of them, if the error had been pointed out, would have promptly corrected it, instead of disgracing himself by undertaking to defend it.

If I had charged that the editor of the *Richmond & Louisville Journal* is the only scribbler that does not know how to use adverbs, his line of defence might be appropriate. Or, if I had said that he is the only dauber of paper with ink who violates that law of our language which requires that the verb shall agree with its nominative in number and person, he might have retreated to the English version of an interpolation into the Lord's prayer, for whatever comfort he could find in showing that he is not the only bungler that has murdered the English language. How weak must that man be, who struts before the public as a rampant critic, and when exposed as one of the very worst of the scribblers that have disgraced literature with bad writing, surrenders almost his entire field as indefensible, and selects two or three points for defense, and pleads, as his only defense for them, that others have committed the same blunders that stain his critical robe. Alas, for the doughty professor with three Xs.

The language of a people exhibits the spirit and character of a people. Hence, the necessity of maintaining the laws, the purity and force of a language; and this necessity is especially incumbent upon those who use the English language. It is dominant now over all other forms of speech, and its power will continue to enlarge through a long future.

I turn, for the present, to an introductory lecture, delivered by Dr. E. S. Gaillard, before the Kentucky School of Medicine, in October, 1868. I do this, because of the double opportunity it presents, first, for showing additional testimonies to Dr. Gaillard's stupid ignorance as a writer, and in some of the most attractive themes of medicine and surgery; secondly, as a profitable occasion for the vindication of some of the noblest truths of

science from Gaillardish displays, and for a proper and just tribute to medical worth.

The introductory lecture, to which I allude, was of great moment to Dr. Gaillard. He had recently come to Kentucky. The medical profession had welcomed him warmly. The opening of the Kentucky school in 1868, with Dr. E. S. Gaillard for the delivery of the introductory lecture, was an occasion that a true man could have turned to account. The occasion brought the recent importation for the first time publicly before the high intelligence of the metropolitan city of Kentucky. Yet, in these circumstances, Dr. Gaillard made a display of his English scholarship, and his pretensions in the science of medicine and surgery, that might have been naturally looked for only in a booby. It taxes credulity to believe that even a pretender should not have sought the aid of some friendly scholar to screen the barbarisms uttered in the lecture, from display in print. But such is the enormity of Dr. Gaillard's self conceit, his vain-glorious ideas of himself, and his repulsiveness toward those who might have helped him through his troubles, that this abominable lecture crept from the lecture room into print, with all its unblushing sins upon its head. It is very likely that the terrible memories of the people of Louisville, connected with that introductory lecture in October, 1868, may have had a great deal to do in causing the men, women and children of this city to turn their backs upon the lecturer when he undertook to "do" Florida for them at his next public exhibition, in the following May.

In the examination of his introductory lecture, I begin with displays of the Gaillard manner of using, or rather, of abusing personal pronouns, and I feel quite sure that every English scholar will agree with me in saying, that a man who cannot properly use pronouns, is utterly unfit for public teaching, either orally or in writing. The manner of using pronouns is a first-class meter of scholarship. I ask the attention of the reader to the Gaillard misuse of pronouns. In order that his sins in the use of pronouns in his introductory lecture may stand forth in their full grotesqueness, I make a preliminary notice of one of Dr. Gaillard's puffs of "proprietary medicines," as they are

called in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, where such things are denounced as unprofessional. In the *Richmond & Louisville Journal*, for December, 1868, editor Gaillard writes in the following style, after receiving an advertisement from Hegeman & Co., to be published in the Medical Journal one year:

"Messrs. *Hegeman & Co.*, have furnished the *editor* with specimens of *his* cod liver oil and elixir of calisaya bark." This looks as though the editor has *proprietary* medicines, and that Messrs. Hegeman & Co. sent *him* specimens of "*his* cod liver oil and elixir of calisaya bark." A full puff of the preparations and of *the house* of Hegeman & Co. follows the quotation just made. And now I ask the reader to look at the Gaillardish use of pronouns in his introductory lecture for the Kentucky School of Medicine, in October, 1868.

I think Dr. Gaillard has a right to estimate highly the patience of the people of Louisville, who sat and listened to the trash he had gathered for that introductory lecture. Its first paragraph consists of three sentences, and in that short space he perpetrates three disgraceful blunders. To the intelligent audience before him, *Professor Gaillard* thus uttered the first sentences of his introductory lecture:

"A few years since, *the Southern States* represented all that is peaceful, exalted and prosperous." "*Her*" (a personal pronoun, in the possessive case, in a singular number, having for its only antecedent, *the Southern States*!) "distinguished sons," etc. Third sentence: "*Her*," still referring to the Southern States, "statesmen were known and admired wherever *mental vigor*, combined with simplicity and purity of character, *are* most esteemed and respected." That was the introduction of an imported lecturer full of pretension, to an intellectual audience in Louisville, Kentucky.

Again: "With a few exceptions, European Governments have invested their medical officers with the highest rank, and with the noblest honors. In *these armies*," etc. What armies? What is the antecedent to *these*? There is none.

In referring to the Southern ladies in their noble work in the hospitals, the lecturer said: they "also visited the hospitals of

their country, not to render a *passing homage*, but to perpetuate *this* by their presence, and to render *it* immortal by their acts." *This* and *it* refer to *passing homage*. How *this* passing homage was *perpetuated* by the presence of the ladies, and how *it* was rendered *immortal* by their acts neither I nor any one else can understand.

Dr. Gaillard, with an absurdity all his own, speaks of Peter the Great, as "a celebrated warrior," and as a "confessed authority" in military matters. And, as if determined that the absurdity should not lack any element of Gaillardistic perfectness, the ex-professor from Virginia classes Peter with Napoleon! And then, he caps his climax by gravely announcing: "there was one lesson in this connection which we could not learn, viz: *who* of these two confessed authorities," etc. A child, properly trained in grammar, would have said, "*which* of these two?" Dr. Gaillard, fatigued probably with this excursion into history, says in his usual style of saying things, that the fighting of Confederate soldiers was of such a character, "that the theories of *both these worthies* must be *abandoned!*" That is, men do not fight best when hungry, or "after eating!" If the Professor XXX's is not a genius for befogging the mind, I do not know of any purpose of life that he can fulfill.

In showing the spirit with which the South universally went into the war, Dr. Gaillard says: "the pruning hook was transformed into the sword; *the ploughshare rusted in the furrow.*" Now, if iron was so valuable that the pruning hook was converted into a weapon, why was the iron of the plough left "*to rust in the furrow?*"

We are told that Macleod teaches "*that* where a soldier has been wounded *about* the skull, there being a fracture of the bone with or without depression of the fragments, *that* it is bad surgery," etc. This is utterly abominable English, and Macleod says nothing of the kind. There is not, in surgical literature, a finer specimen of reasoning, nor better surgical observations than those of Macleod on wounds of the head. They were adopted, almost in every particular, by Dr. Chisolm, in the Surgical Manual he prepared for the Confederate service, and in the third

edition of Chisolm's Military Surgery, published since the close of the war, the accomplished author, from experience in the Confederate war, advocates the great principles laid down by Macleod.

From a careful survey of the whole subject of wounds of the head, a survey, guided by Hennan, Guthrie, Hewett, Cole and Williamson, the value of their guidance being measured by the philosophical teachings of Professor B. W. Dudley, I feel fully warranted in saying that the surgeon who may have cases of injuries of the skull to treat, and who is guided by Macleod, will give his patients the full benefits of the resources of scientific surgery.

Professor Chisolm is a surgeon, which Dr. Gaillard is not. The principles respecting the trephine, uttered by Dr. Gaillard in his introductory lecture, if carried into practice, would be murderous. Fortunately he is not an authority in anything.

The lecturer says, "That familiar flag was furled which for so many years had *panoplied* the victorious hosts," etc. Panoply is full armor, and panoplied is to be covered with armor. It is easy enough to understand that the armed hosts *panoplied* the flag, but that the flag *panoplied* the hosts, is a Gaillardism, the meaning of which no one can conceive.

In speaking of the use of the trephine for wounds "*about the skull*," to use a regular Gaillardism, the introductory gives some remarkable and "unexpected results;" one is, "*the patients recovered very frequently*." If this is true, the patients must have relapsed very often, because, without doing so, they could not have "recovered very frequently." The second "unexpected result" in the Gaillard record, is, "*the previous mortality was immediately reduced*." Now this could be accomplished only by the resurrection of some of those who had died in "the previous mortality!" Here, then, we have in the Gaillard record of a surgery, purporting to be contrary to British principles, quite an approach to what Ezekiel saw in his vision in the valley of dry bones. Are we to understand, as a part of the Gaillard flourish of the trephine, that "patients will recover frequently," and that a resurrection of some of those who made "the pre-

vious mortality" may be expected now, however "unexpected" it was before?

Another of the "gains" of the war is thus set forth by the imported lecturer: "To a Confederate surgeon, Dr. H. F. Campbell, of Georgia, is due the credit of having instituted the ligation of *the chief artery supplying a gangrenous limb for the eradication of the disease.*" This is a part of the arterial system, of which I never heard, until in this revelation of Gaillardism. That there is a system of arteries, divided into chief and subordinate vessels, "supplying a gangrenous limb for the eradication of the disease" is an astonishing thing in pathological surgery! Why so good a surgeon as Professor Frazer Campbell should ligate the chief artery engaged in the beneficent work of "eradicating gangrene" from a limb, is something that I cannot explain. Another remarkable recovery relates to "compound gun-shot fractures" in the upper third of the thigh. Dr. Gaillard says, the prevailing doctrine was in favor of amputation, but that this was reversed by the war, and we have this ingenious Gaillardistic record of the result of the reversal of European practice: "It warrants the frequent preservation of the limb." This is a remarkable result, but it is unfortunate that Dr. Gaillard does not indicate how *often* a man may have "a compound gun-shot fracture" in the upper third of the thigh, and have a "warrant for the *frequent* preservation of the limb." If the ex-professor should ever get to deliver another introductory lecture, I hope he will supply surgery with this important information.

Another Gaillardist triumph of the trephine, must be mentioned. Dr. Gaillard says that by that instrument, "interrupted consciousness and impaired intellection *may be restored.*" How, he does not say. I should prefer some means by which *consciousness* and *intellection* may be restored, instead of the restoration of *interrupted* consciousness and *impaired* intellection! Dr. Gaillard is sublime in some of his surgical records. The specimens I have given, and many of an analogous character, for which I cannot spare space, run like little "serpents," in every part of this disgraceful introductory lecture. His "only"

in it, are as independent of all rule, and of all relationship to meaning, as if they had publicly proclaimed themselves as out-laws. Then we have such stuff as "the wounded were *largely* treated," etc. How to "largely reduce, etc. spasms from *sustained* wounds;" for "*four long years* the contest continued," when we know that those years consisted of just three hundred and sixty-five days. In his *Richmond Journal*, two months after this lecture, he said the war lasted *five* years. He says, also, that the Confederate service formed the singular exception in not having, for the medical corps, "any absolute rank." He lugubriously adds: "though thus *stripped* of title," etc. How could they be *stripped* of what they did not have? Can a naked man have clothes *stripped* from him?

In continuation of this Jeremiad, the lecturer compares the honors awarded to medical men in the Federal army, to the treatment of the Confederate medical men and asks: "Shall not those who, with all the difficulties of closed ports and empty chests, always equalled and often excelled them, not have their reward?" In our language, two negatives make an affirmative. A correct translation of the above Gaillardism into English is: "Shall not those who always equalled and often excelled them, *fail to* have a reward?" And while complaining of the neglect of the Confederate authorities toward their medical men in not awarding to them crowns of laurel leaves, with a beautiful sense of Gaillardish propriety and taste, the lecturer, addressing an audience of medical students, of other gentlemen and of ladies, exquisitely asks: "Will this assembly confer it?" viz: the laurel crown. The assembly with its ears full of the gibberish of the address, showing the miserable want of mental clothing, probably thought that fig leaves would be more appropriate for the specimen before them than laurel leaves.

In his usual clumsy style, Dr. Gaillard attempts to describe the revolution that has taken place in blood letting. He describes with what he takes to be humor, "young physic boasting that he has never seen a lancet, entrenching *himself* behind *his* wine, *his* whisky, *his* brandy, *his* beef essence, * * * in the triumph of his pride regarding *himself* as the very *paragon* of physic!" A

man regarding himself as "the very paragon of physic." Why the genius of Shakespeare in time-honored Dogberry, or that of Sheridan in old mother Malaprop, or that of the venerable dame Partington scarcely rivals the spontaneous utterances of Dr. Gaillard in butchery of the English language.

We learn also, that "in the Federal armies there died *from action* or from wounds," etc. Pray what is "from action?" Is it a torpedo or a new projectile? But I am tired of the man's miserable "little serpents," and I leave the rest of the brood for the present.

Is it not amazing that a man, utterly poverty stricken in every species of medical knowledge, and thoroughly ignorant of even the rudiments of English composition, should have the audacity to come into one of the most intellectual cities of the great interior valley, and appear as a public lecturer before an audience of intelligent people? It is shameful that any one should be able to exhibit such an amount of impudence. It is more than likely that there were few persons that listened to this mass of chaff and trash, called Gaillard's introductory lecture, who could not have corrected its outrages and inexcusable violations of English grammar.

In the pretentious department of the lecture devoted to scientific display, Dr. Gaillard is, if possible, worse than in his grammatical sins.

He makes scarcely an approach to correctness in anything in medical or surgical science, but I must content myself with a few examples of his most deplorable ignorance.

I take my first example of Gaillardistic stupidity in reference to an interesting point in the surgery of gun-shot wounds. I know of few points of more interest in surgery than that which I propose to elaborate. The introductory lecture of Dr. Gaillard speaks in the following style, on a *discovery* in the late internecine war. "When a wound is made with a clean knife, or other sharp instrument, there is, in a short time, manifested a vital fluid, which agglutinates the contiguous surfaces, and the wound heals by what surgeons have been pleased to term 'first intention.' This mode of reparation was once considered *only*

possible under the circumstances mentioned. It was consequently held, that a gun-shot wound could not heal in this way, as the opposing surfaces, instead of being smooth, were rough and mutilated. Indeed, so strong was this conviction, that writers on surgery teach that gun-shot wounds do not heal by first intention, and with many, such a mode of healing would be regarded as strong evidence of the wound having been caused by an entirely different agent. By means of circulars sent to most surgeons of the Confederate army, testimony on this important subject was extensively elicited, and the result proved, conclusively, in very many instances, when a wound was produced, even by the tearing and destructive action of the minnie ball, *that union by first intention was indisputable.*"

Had I been told that a medical man, occupying even a seeming conspicuous position in the teaching department of the profession, professing to be a great writer on medical subjects, and making pretensions to the powers of a terrible critic in professional matters, had uttered here in Kentucky, such a mass of professional ignorance, as that which I have just quoted, I should have doubted the truth of the statement. But as Dr. Gaillard has published the lecture containing it, I must believe it. The Kentucky School of Medicine has, at the head of its faculty, the name of Professor B. W. Dudley, as Emeritus Professor of Surgery, and, as a matter of course, the faculty of that school must know something of the illustrious deeds that entitle him to an Emeritus professorship in surgery. There is no one thing in the great career of that eminent man, on which he more confidently rested his claims as a master surgeon, than upon his teachings of the powers of the bandage in a large department of surgery. And in this department the successful management of gun-shot wounds, with the bandage, was perhaps the most conspicuous in his teaching. Of the thousands who heard him on this subject, I doubt whether there was one who was not profoundly impressed with Professor Dudley's views on the treatment with the bandage, of gun-shot wounds. There was nothing in the whole course of his surgical lectures that excited greater enthusiasm among medical students, than that

admirable lecture which he gave on the general powers of the bandage, preliminary to his details on the subject. His teaching filled the minds of medical men throughout the South. When the recent war commenced, there were hundreds of prominent medical men in the South who had learned the use of the bandage in gun-shot wounds, directly from this great teacher, and other hundreds who had received instruction indirectly from him. He taught as early as 1817, that gun-shot wounds can be made to heal by the first intention. In 1828, Professor Dudley published a paper in the *Transylvania Journal of Medicine*, on the use of the bandage in gun-shot wounds and fractures, in which a great number of interesting cases are given, and all the principles of the use of the roller are taught. I have treated a great number of gun-shot wounds, some of them of a severe character, and I have never depended on any other form of treatment than that taught by Professor Dudley. I am quite positive that I have seen as many gun-shot wounds heal by the first intention as I have seen wounds of any other kind heal in that way. Dr. Gaillard says: "Indeed, so strong was this conviction, that writers on surgery teach that gun-shot wounds do not heal by first intention." And he sets up a claim that the war reversed the opinion on the subject, that was prevalent before the discoveries made during the war. How it is possible for any one who pretends to be a teacher of medicine, to be as ignorant as Dr. Gaillard is on as important a subject as the proper treatment of gun-shot wounds, I cannot understand. I am happy to see that Dr. J. D. Winston, of Nashville, with a thorough understanding of the great surgical teacher, Professor Dudley, and a full knowledge of the principles taught by Professor Dudley, has contributed an important paper to the *NASHVILLE JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY* for July, on the use of the bandage in surgical diseases. Under the lights of my experience, I cordially subscribe to the doctrines taught in Dr. Winston's paper. Yet, under the egis of the mighty name of Professor B. W. Dudley, as Emeritus Professor of Surgery in the Kentucky School of Medicine, Dr. Gaillard had the hardihood to utter his miserable stuff, which I have quoted, on the

revelation made by the war in the South, that gun-shot wounds may heal by the first intention, a doctrine which Professor B. W. Dudley devoted forty years of an active teaching career, in illustrating and demonstrating. It was a most shameful display of ignorance on the part of Dr. Gaillard.

I must be very brief in disposing of Dr. Gaillard's ridiculous ignorance about the recency of the discovery that gun-shot wounds heal by the first intention. Without referring to even a tythe of the authorities on the subject of that form of healing, I may mention that Heister taught the doctrine about the middle of the eighteenth century. John Bell, upwards of seventy years ago, taught this great doctrine in one of the finest lectures on the bandage, that grace surgical literature. I made extensive quotations from it, in an article on the bandage, published nearly twenty years ago, in the *Western Journal of Medicine and Surgery*.

John Hunter, the founder of a brilliant school of surgeons, of which Abernethy, Physic and Dudley were great lights, taught that gun-shot wounds can be made to heal by the first intention.

John Syng Dorsey, a nephew and pupil of Professor Physic, and one of the most illustrious surgeons of his day, in his work on Surgery, vol. I, p 52, published in 1813, says, that gun-shot wounds "do often heal by the first intention."

Lebert, in Archiv. Gen. de Med. Tom. viii, p 341, says: "Courses of wounds by fire-arms sometimes heal partly or wholly by 'first intention.'"

Cloquet, in 1827, taught that "we may attempt the uniting by the first intention of the base of the strips, and their top alone suppurates in this case."

In Lenoir's edition of Roche and Sanson's, Pathol. Medico. Chirurgicale, Tom. iii, p 411, in speaking of wounds healing by the first intention, we find this statement: "wounds resulting from the passage of gun-balls through the parts, may heal in the same way. Facts of this kind have been observed by Hunter and Larrey." An account is added, of a young man, in July, 1830, "who had his thigh traversed from side to side by a

ball, and in whose case, only the orifices suppurated, so that he was well in a few days."

In 1817, Henry Prentiss, of Lexington, was wounded in a duel. "The ball passed through both thighs, cutting the femoral artery of the right thigh, and wounding the femoral nerve of the left. The wounds were made by an ounce ball. The blood spirted from the femoral artery, a distance of from two to three feet." These terrible wounds, the hemorrhage included, were treated by the bandage, and the wounds healed by the first intention. This case gave Professor Dudley great celebrity, which he largely increased by subsequent triumphs of the bandage, during a great practice, and active teaching of many years continuance.

M. Jobert, in *Plaies D'armes a Feu*, p 35, says: "Some have advised to re-unite, by the first intention, certain wounds by fire-arms, those of the face, for example. Hunter, and other English surgeons, have warmly advocated this mode of treatment, and have made a pompous eulogium upon all its advantages, sometimes even upon those which it really does not possess. It is a fact, however, that success has often been attained by following their directions, especially in cases in which the contusion was moderate. I have been able myself, by the wounded of our bloody days of July, 1830, to establish the truth of the observations of the English surgeons."

It is unnecessary to enlarge these details. They show conclusively that the doctrine of healing gun-shot wounds by the first intention, which Dr. Gaillard, in his ignorance, supposes was discovered by the Confederate surgeons during the war, is a very old form of teaching, and that it is taught by many of the great lights of surgery.

Another great discovery, over which Dr. Gaillard crowed lustily, in his introductory lecture, is in relation to saving bones that have lost their periosteum. He says, the doctrine was, "denuded bone must die," and that "in obedience to this testimony, where bone was discovered to be denuded, it was promptly removed. *The surgical records of the war show that this was bad practice,*" etc. This statement thus made of this as

a discovery of the war is another display of ignorance. Professor Dudley taught fully forty-five years ago that denuded bone can be saved, and he published striking examples of the fact. But that the doctrine is taught in "the Surgical Records of the War" I deny on the testimony of Dr. Gaillard himself, and I know that it is not taught in *Chisolm's Military Surgery*. Dr. Chisolm had the means of gathering for that work, everything bearing on improvements in surgery, that Surgeon H. Baer could find, and this discovery about the reparation of denuded bone is not named in the manual. The flourish in the introductory lecture in the assertion that "the surgical records of the war" make any revelation on the reparation of bone denuded of periosteum is contradicted by some painful experience, with which Dr. Gaillard is familiar. He ventured to publish in 1866, the doctrine that bone denuded of periosteum may be saved. In the *Richmond Journal*, for January, 1868, he refers to the fact that private criticisms, by persons competent to criticise such matters, had been made on his article of 1866. The "competent critics" declared that "the doctrine is untenable, and that it is not supported by the investigations of modern pathology." If, as Dr. Gaillard asserted, *the surgical records of the war* sustained the Gaillard doctrine, he would have met his critics with those surgical records. But he did nothing of the kind. He waited until 1868, and then attempted to prove his point, not by "the surgical records of the war," but by a European work, analysed in the *London Lancet*. The work is by M. Ollier. These facts show that Dr. Gaillard had not any "surgical records of the war" to help him, and the statement in the introductory lecture is mere moonshine. This Gaillardism belongs to the category in which Sheridan said Mr. Dunning indulged. Dr. Gaillard "drew upon his imagination for his facts." Even Ollier teaches the vast importance of the periosteum in osseous reparative agencies, and the Gaillard sweeping declaration in the introductory lecture is not sustained by any surgical authorities. The nutrient artery of a bone has much to do with reparative agencies in the bone, as Curling and Bransby Cooper have demonstrated. Professor Syme shows that where the cir-

cumference of a bone is removed, and the periosteum is included in the removal, the reparative agency is very limited when compared with that which takes place where the periosteum is preserved. Frayrer, in his clinical surgery in India, is clear, correct and emphatic on this subject. The "surgical records of the war" do not make the least revelation on the subject of "denuded bones" that was not well and extensively known long before the war.

The remarks in the lecture, on yellow fever, are absurd and contemptible in the assumption that there is one cause for that disease in one place, and an entirely different cause for it in another place. I will not dignify such nonsense by even contradicting it.

The luminous Dr. Gaillard tells us that other lessons were taught by the war. They are: "the discovery that measles, scarlet fever, (how about scarlatina?) small pox, etc. 'were' (or are?) 'self limiting,'" and the discovery of the value of an abundance of fresh air. He struts over these utterances as though the facts were unknown before the war. He is utterly ignorant of the literature of his profession. Rhazes 'was born about the middle of the ninth century, and he became a great master in medicine and in various other sciences. To him we are indebted for the earliest account of small pox and measles that has descended to our times, and his treatment of those diseases has not been improved upon by any modern author. Abundance of cool air, water—cooled by mixing snow with it, cool acidulated drinks, opening the bowels with juices of fruits, sugar, whey and cool baths are among the chief methods of treatment commended by Rhazes. The revival of the chief of these means, especially cool air and cool drinks, has been very properly ascribed to Sydenham, and Boerhaave extended Sydenham's practice over the continent of Europe. But the meagre reading of Dr. Gaillard made him look upon these methods as discoveries during the war. Dr. Bond, editor of the *Episcopal Methodist*, published at Baltimore, severely scourged Dr. Gaillard's ignorance on these subjects.

On the subject of Tetanus, Dr. Gaillard claims great discov-

eries for Confederate surgeons. He says: "tetanus was comparatively a rare incident in the practice of Confederate surgeons, *this result being conspicuously due to the fact that the wounded were largely treated in open tents, or in hospitals unceiled or unplastered.* In other words, *European teaching tends to produce tetanus, while, by the American lessons we have learned how to prevent it,* etc. Now, there is no truth in any portion of the sentence that I have italicised. Chisolm, who is a great authority in such matters, says, "tetanus cannot infect a hospital," consequently, "unceiled or unplastered hospitals" had nothing to do toward the prevention of tetanus. Chisolm, thus disposes of the ignorance of Dr. Gaillard in the insulting allusion to European teaching: tetanus "*is not more frequent among our wounded than it is in Europe.*" In the Crimean service Macleod mentions but thirteen cases as occurring in camp, and in the hospitals." Thus the master surgeon rebukes the pretender.

I have given a sufficient number of examples of Dr. Gaillard's thorough ignorance of the profession, in which he aspires to be a teacher. I doubt whether he has capacity for being even a student of medicine. The exposure of such an arrant pretender as Dr. Gaillard, would be a poor reward for even the little labor it costs. I have taken advantage of the occasion thus offered, to present to the minds of medical men some of the most valuable truths connected with our profession.

Can there be any cause for wonder over the low condition of medical teaching when such an ignoramus as Dr. Gaillard pushes himself forward as a teacher in the lecture room, and as an editor of a medical journal? He is not familiar with any one thing that belongs to medical science, and he cannot write the most ordinary thought, not even a puff of "a proprietary medicine," in such a way as to convey a correct meaning. "No man can represent clearly and definitely the image in his mind, unless his view of it be full and perfect." The focus of Dr. Gaillard's mind has a veil of ignorance perpetually in front of it, so that the sun of science never gets even a part of a ray into the dull camera of his brain. Tristram Shandy seems to

have made a spot of some kind on it. In Dr. Gaillard's warfare upon Dr. Dawson, he *naively* tells of a *Brahmin* Student, who was pestered by a blue-bottle fly. The *Brahmin* determined to crush the pest, but when he caught it, he had compassion on it, and raising the sash, he turned it loose, saying, "this world is large enough for thee and me; I will not crush thee." Readers of English literature are under the impression that Dr. Gaillard's "Brahmin" is old "Uncle Toby," and that Lawrence Sterne is the author of this story of the fly! Does Dr. Gaillard know any one thing? From what I have seen of him, in this introductory lecture, I shall not be surprised, should he ever have a chance to deliver another introductory lecture, to find him claiming that the English alphabet was discovered during "the late war."

I have thus presented a catalogue of some of the utterly contemptible shams clothed in the very barbarisms of English speech, which this pretentious imported lecturer shamelessly addressed to an audience of intelligent people in Louisville. It is almost incredible that such an ignoramus as Dr. Gaillard should attempt to lecture in a settlement of backwoodsmen. Yet, he coolly made a display of his ignorance of medicine and surgery, and of the ordinary laws of the English language, before an audience in the city of Louisville.

I quoted, in the beginning of these remarks, the solemn pledges made by Dr. Gaillard, covenants made with his subscribers, his associate editors, and with the medical profession.

How these covenants have been kept, the subscribers to the journal know. He indulges in the most acrimonious quarrels, and wages as bitter a warfare as his gibberish can express toward all who cross his path. His uncalled-for warfare upon Dr. Dawson, Professor Bowling, and the Nashville School of Medicine, the *Pacific Medical and Surgical Journal*, his contemptible and inexcusable flings at Professor Parvin, and his unprovoked and unwarranted attack upon me, are specimens of the manner in which he keeps faith with his subscribers. He quarrels more than all the other medical editors of the country put together. He has more *political* matter in his miserable journal

than is published in all the other medical journals of the United States. Notwithstanding his pledges, he has levelled his paltry, contemptible, malicious medical politics at the Medical Department of the University of Louisville, month after month.

In one of his numerous slanders upon me, he charges that I have sheltered myself under the plea of age and religion. He can point to no one instance in which I ever did anything of the kind. Such calumnies are atrocious. I assail no one. When I am assailed and bullied, without cause or excuse, I give my assailants what my judgment tells me they deserve, and I never pleaded any kind of excuse for my conduct. My assailants shall not select their method of attack, and my method of response. The latter is my exclusive right, and I will exercise it without any kind of excuse or apology.

But in the presence of those pledges I have quoted from his journal for January 1868, and June, 1868, he vilely rakes the ashes of an affair between Dr. S. P. Breckenridge and myself, and as usual with him, he misrepresents the matter. I have only this to say on that subject: Dr. Breckenridge does not need his bungling aid. Dr. Breckenridge is infinitely his superior in general scholarship, and is as far above him as a master of medical science, as one man can well be above another. Dr. Breckenridge has the means for making a noble future in his profession, and no one will rejoice more in seeing him reach renown than I shall. It is a great pity, a crying shame that age has not mellowed the tart temper of Dr. Gaillard, and that religion of some kind does not guide him in the affairs of life. Had these good influences exercised themselves upon him in time, he might have saved himself from every feud and quarrel that has disgraced the pages of the *Richmond & Louisville Journal*. If he were half as desirous of elevating the medical profession, and enlarging the domain of science, as he is to get into senseless broils with members of the profession, to which broils he invariably gives a personal turn, he might possibly make himself of some utility to his medical brethren.

I have tried Dr. Gaillard on his public positions alone. In no instance have I overstepped that boundary by the indulgence

of any personalities, except those that are inseparable from a writer, in reviewing the evidence he furnishes in his writings, of the character of his mind.

With these remarks, I dismiss, for the present, the scribbler of the *Richmond & Louisville Medical Journal*.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since these forms were printed I was placed in possession of indubitable proof of a literary crime perpetrated by Dr. E. S. Gaillard, which must condemn him most severely in the estimation of every honorable mind in the profession. The crime is **PLAGIARISM**, and Webster defines a **PLAGIARIST**: "one who purloins another's writings, and offers them to the public as his own." In the body of the pamphlet which unveils the pseudo-critic, I referred to an egregious blunder in which Young Physic is described as "a paragon of physic." That was the only comment I made about the description of Young Physic and the lancet. I was surprised when I read that part of Dr. Gaillard's introductory lecture at the easy flow of the sentences, at their vast superiority in sense, vigor, and accuracy over any thing that I had seen from his pen. The mystery is explained. About the 14th of October, 1867, Professor S. D. Gross delivered an Introductory Lecture before the Jefferson Medical School, in Philadelphia, and on the 5th of October, 1868, Professor Gaillard delivered the Introductory Lecture, on the shabbiness and stupidity of which I have commented in this pamphlet. I ask the reader to compare the two lecturers on "Young Physic." I place the quotations in parallel columns.

PROFESSOR GROSS'S LECTURE, 1867,
PAGE 22.

"The lancet, formerly the inseparable pocket companion of the physician, now rests quietly in its case, incrustated with rust, a thing of the past, an object of curiosity and reproach. * * * Young Physic boasts that he has never seen a lancet, and expresses surprise that such a weapon should have been in such universal use. Taking the practice of the present day as his standpoint, he can not see why such a sanguinary operation

DR. GAILLARD'S LECTURE, 1868,
PAGE 10.

"The lancet, formerly the inseparable companion of the physician, now rests quietly in its case, incrustated with rust; a thing of the past; an object of curiosity and reproach. Young Physic boasts that he has never seen a lancet, and expresses his surprise that such a weapon should ever have been in universal use. Taking the practice of the present day as his guide, he can not see why such a sanguinary operation should

should ever have been necessary. He looks with disgust at the conduct of his predecessors, loudly declaims against their want of judgment, and like the Pharisee in the Bible devoutly thanks God that he is not like other men. Scrupulously abstaining from the spilling of blood, he entrenches himself behind his wine, his whisky, his brandy, his milk punch, and his beef-essence, bids defiance to disease, and in the triumph of his pride regards himself the very *god of physic*."

On page 39 we have:

Dr. Rush, meeting unexpectedly an old friend during the height of the yellow fever in 1798, asked him why he had not left town. He replied that he had sent his family away, but could not leave himself. "Then," said Dr. Rush, "go home and be bled immediately."

The great physician had evidently studied Moliere, in whose time, when the practice of bleeding was in full force, high health was a thing to be feared, and to be subdued with the lancet and "dulcifying clysters." If the person remonstrated, the reply was: "The method is salutary; and as one drinks for thirst to come, one must likewise be bled for illness to come."

The practice of bleeding and purging in the spring, as a means of purifying the blood, and thus protecting the system against disease in the hot summer months, prevailed almost universally for ages, and was abandoned only when bleeding and active purging became unfashionable in the treatment of inflammation. I recollect it was the custom thirty-five years ago, in the spring, for scores upon scores of people, especially in the rural districts, to go to the doctors to be bled. Sometimes non-professional men performed the operation on a large scale. The late Mr. Hazard, one of the founders of Mauch Chunk, in the early days of that settlement, when physicians were scarce, had quite an extensive practice of this kind. One day a stout, hale-looking Irishman came up to be bled. "Mr. Hazard, and how much do you charge for takin' a pint o' blood?"—the quantity usually drawn. "Nothing," was the reply. "Then, by St. Peter," said Pat, "you may take a whole quart from me."

ever have been necessary. He looks with disgust at the conduct of his predecessors, loudly declaiming against their want of judgment, and, like the Pharisee in the Bible, is devoutly thankful that he is not like other men. Scrupulously abstaining from spilling blood, he entrenches himself behind his wine, his whisky, his brandy, his milk punch, and his beef-essence, bidding defiance to disease, and, in the triumph of his pride, regarding himself as the very paragon of physic."

DR. GAILLARD'S LECTURE, page 10.

"Meeting, unexpectedly, an old friend, during the height of the yellow fever, in 1790, he," Dr. Rush, "asked him why he had not left the city. The friend replied that he had sent his family away, but could not leave himself. 'Then,' said Dr. Rush, 'go home, my friend, and be bled immediately.' This great physician had evidently studied Moliere, who, in the days when high health was to be feared and to be subdued with the lancet, declared, in regard to bleeding, 'the method is salutary, and as one drinks for thirst to come, one must likewise be bled for illness to come.' The custom of bleeding, even during the last generation, was so universal, that where physicians could not be obtained, the people submitted themselves to any one blessed with the possession of a lancet. The late Mr. Hazard, a prominent gentleman in the West, (?) 'though ignorant of medicine, had a large practice of this kind. One day a stout, hale-looking Irishman came up to be bled. 'Mr. Hazard,' said he, 'and how much do you charge for taking a pint of blood?' (the quantity usually drawn). 'Nothing,' was the reply. 'Then, by St. Patrick,' says Pat, 'you may take a quart!'

When the reader sees the thoroughness of the plagiarism by Dr. Gaillard from Professor Gross's lecture, he can readily account for the fact that the description of Young Physic in Dr. Gaillard's lecture is an oasis in the sterile wastes of that shabby production. In order to hide the plagiarism, Dr. Gaillard makes patch-work. Preliminary to the plagiarism from page 22 of Dr. Gross's lecture, Dr. Gaillard "conveys" material from Dr. Gross's Introductory, page 30, as the reader will perceive by examination of the parallels.

Byron lays down this mandate:

"Thou shalt not steal from Samuel Rogers,"

and Dr. Gaillard should have read it,

Thou shalt not steal from Dr. Gross.

The reader may ask, were there not quotation marks, indicating borrowing? I ask in return, how can a man make quotation marks in *delivering* a lecture? There is not an allusion to Professor Gross in Dr. Gaillard's Lecture, nor a mark indicating indebtedness, in the printed copy, to any portion of that paralleled with the quotation from Professor Gross's lecture. It was a literary "conveying," as Ancient Pistol phrases it, that displays more taste than I supposed that Dr. Gaillard possessed. Dr. Gross's lecture furnished Dr. Gaillard a considerable stock in trade. Dr. Gross made a scholarly reference to Molière, and Dr. Gaillard attempts imitation, but in a clumsy manner, and with a most disgraceful *trading* that displays supreme ignorance of Molière's French. Dr. Gross introduced a quotation from Molière's *Le Medecin Malgre Lui*, as an illustration of the description of Young Physic and the change of practice. Dr. Gaillard snips, with his well-used scissors, this quotation from its place, and patches it in at the close of *the* lecture before the Kentucky School. He does not give the name of the comedy from which the dialogue between Sganarelle and Gerote was taken, and in spelling Sgana-

relle drops the last two letters. Dr. Gross does not name the comedy from which *he* quoted, and in spelling Sganarelle's name *he* omits the last two letters. Thus Dr. Gaillard illustrates the physical law; the stream cannot rise higher than its fountain. Dr. Gross's lecture is entitled, "Then and Now," and Dr. Gaillard recently perpetrated in the Richmond and Louisville Journal a piece of Police Gazette literature which he called "Now and Then."

Many gentlemen feel an honorable pride in calling themselves Dr. Gross's students. No one of them is more entitled to be called a student of Dr. Gross than Dr. Gaillard.

Dr. E. S. Gaillard, thus stripped to the scorn and contempt of honorable men, is a beautiful specimen of an ambitious, pretentious critic, living in a glass house, his dwelling shivered over his head. Alas for Dr. Gaillard, that

"In our aspirations to be great
We oft o'erleap our mortal state."

I have performed unflinchingly a duty, a sacred duty, notwithstanding the mouthings and moanings of intrusive, self-constituted Professors of Deportment, which I owed to a learned, an honorable, a noble profession, in exposing a miserable sham, a shameless plagiarist, who clothes even vile plagiarism with shabbiness. I congratulate these Journalistic Turveydrops on their pet prize-essayist, their model professional specimen, over whom they spread their covering-wings!

I now owe a duty to my self-respect. A writer in Frazer's Magazine, nearly forty years ago, quoted a colloquy between Queen Bess and Lord Bacon. The Queen was desirous to take hold of Hayward, on account of his life of Henry IV., and inquired of Bacon "whether there was treason in the book." He answered, "No, Madam; for *treason* I cannot deliver my opinion that there is any, but very much *felony*." The Queen gladly asked, "How, and wherein?" Bacon replied, "Because he hath stolen many of his sentences and conceits out

of Cornelius Tacitus." What would Bacon have said if Hayward had made almost a whole page of patches *stolen from different pages* of Tacitus, disfigured in places as gipsies disfigure stolen children? In literary law this is grand larceny. Honest writers hold it incumbent on them, even when they make quotation marks and announce the authors, to specify any alterations they may make, such as italicizing, changing words, or any change whatever. Dr. Gaillard feels no such scruples. For example: While Dr. Gross truthfully describes Mr. Hazard as one of the founders of the beautiful and romantic dwelling spot on the shore of Lehigh River called Mauch Chunk, noted as the home of the exiled Louis Philippe and yet possessing the garden laid out and planted by his gardener, Dr. Gaillard, when plagiarizing this in a wholesale way, makes a gipsy mark on Mr. Hazard in announcing him as "a prominent gentleman in the West!" Dr. Gaillard knows nothing of Mr. Hazard except what he "conveyed" from Dr. Gross, and, being ignorant of geography, he probably thought *Mauch Chunk* was among the Rocky Mountains, or in some other Western region. Sir Walter Scott was so nice in his integrity as a writer that, in a note to the *Lady of the Lake*, he says: "The author deems it necessary to apologise for the inadvertent appropriation of a whole line from the tragedy of *Douglas*." Had he patched up a page with appropriations or "conveyings" from John Home, his apology would not have amounted to much.

When my exposure of Dr. Gaillard's outrageous plagiarism appeared, his little squad of admirers were confounded. He went about from corner to corner, haranguing such persons as he could catch and hold, and pretended to read a letter from Dr. Gross, drawn forth by such representations as he had found it convenient to get up. Oh, that he would publish it. He was brazen and stupid enough to announce that he had intended to use quotation marks in printing the lecture, but was sick when it was printed, and could

not attend to the proofs. This imbecile excuse does not cover the *delivered* lecture. In that, he palmed upon the audience, in the hall of the Kentucky School of Medicine, all his "conveyings" from Dr. Gross's *lecture*, as his own work. Quotation marks in the printed lecture would not have mitigated the literary larceny of the oral lecture. But this plea that, but for sickness, he would have made quotation marks in the printed lecture, shows the man's ideas of right and wrong. While "conveying" from Dr. Gross's lecture in wholesale style, he had disfigured Dr. Gross's work with alterations enough to absolutely prohibit unexplained quotation marks. The use of them, with Dr. Gaillard's disfigurements of Dr. Gross's language, would have *added* literary forgery to the crime of plagiarism. None will question its improper character.

That Dr. Gaillard was sick, very sick, while he was preparing his Introductory Lecture, when he was delivering it, during the time the printers were at work on it, and throughout the period of publishing ten monthly numbers of the Richmond and Louisville Journal, published since the lecture was *delivered*, I freely and fully admit. The proof is too clear and decisive to permit a reasonable doubt. This loathsome sickness is called literary *kleptomania*.

Self-respect requires me to say, that had I known in the beginning, Dr. Gaillard's degrading plagiarisms, I should never have descended to notice him. But having done so I say now, should he deny or attempt to palliate his guilt as a wholesale plagiarist, I will do with him as Macaulay did with Barre, one of the French execrables, gibbet him for the gaze and execration of mankind.